



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

arreglo, liviano, prenda (the meaning of *pledge, security*, is not given), desaseado, invertir (the voc. has *investir*), cordillera, explotación, agotar, envolver, guisos, terciado, veredicto, previamente, estepa, hebra, naranja, enredo, azar, asustar (but *asustarse, to shy*, said of a horse), ancho, amortización, antemano, semejante, semejanza, política (*policy*), ambiente,, afines, varón, costar, suavizar, culebra, matiz, astro, labriego, asemejar, desarrollar, aldea, enredadera, colgar, desorden, árbol, oír, papagayo, roble, arroyuelo, ribera, aumentar, altanero, río, gemir, paloma, cola, azulado, amontonamiento, aplanar, arriba, abajo, paredón, cojín, pincel, campesino, pesar, pacer, hato, alelí, parásita, azucena, obsequio, botoncillo, alambre, compra, antepasado, abrir, suceso, cerdo, paisaje, agrupación, pescuezo, almidonado, actitud, apresuradamente, fulano, albur, alfombra, susto, agregar, joya, savia, carcajada, pomarrosa (not found in the dictionary of the academy), horadado, exprofeso, rayo, trascurso, recurso, respetuoso, lata, donaire, parandero, sencillez, mecha.

If the criticism which I have ventured to offer is justifiable, the errors may easily be corrected in a future edition. In all that is essential the book is well edited and is a valuable addition to our text-books on Spanish. The editor has done his own (Argentina) and the other Latin-American countries as well as the American teacher and student of Spanish a valuable service by its publication. It cannot fail to stimulate the interest in our neighbors to the south. The publishers deserve praise for the handsome appearance of the volume.

NILS FLATEN.

St. Olaf College.

Zur Geschichte der westgermanischen Konjunktion 'und,' von E. H. Sehrt. [Hesperia, No. 8.] Baltimore, The Johns Hopkins Press, 1916. 56 pp.

It would seem as if the title of this commendable work represented adequately neither the character of the study nor its special value as a contribution to knowledge. All that the captions of the four chapters and a cursory examination of their contents suggest, is the morphological evolution of the West Germanic copulative conjunction *und*. The divisions, I. Entwicklung der Konjunktion **andi* im Gemeingermanischen, II. Die ahd. Konjunktion *joh* und got. *jah*, III. Die Entwicklung der Form *andi* im Westgermanischen, IV. *Anda, Ende, Inde* im späteren Mittelalter, indicate no more

than the tracing of the conjunction from its first appearance, under the form of *anti*, *andi*, thru the intermediate stages of *enti*, *inti*, *inte*, *unte* and *unde*, to its modern derivative *und*. To all appearances, this may have been the genetic development of the problem. Yet, as the finished work now stands, its importance seems to lie not so much in the fixation of such formal disparities as predominantly in the elaboration of a new means of control for the differentiation of the old West Germanic dialects. This device consists in making use of the chronological and territorial expansion of the various forms of the conjunction, on the basis of a comprehensive exploitation of the existing documents. The reviewer believes that, despite a residue of doubt arising from the mixture of dialects in some of the manuscripts, due either to scribal interference or to a process of translation from one idiom into another, sufficiently reliable results can be obtained,—and have been obtained by the dissertator at least to an extent which would have justified the placing of this new criterion in the centre of gravity of his fascicle. A title, somewhat like ‘Die Konjunktion *Und* als Kennzeichen in der westgermanischen Dialektabgrenzung,’ with an introductory chapter listing and discussing the comparative value of all other touchstones thus far advanced,—the beginnings of such a list can be found on p. 30 of the dissertation,—with a necessary shifting of the point of view from the formal examination of the conjunction to the more vital consideration of dialects and documents, the latter to furnish the designations for the chapters, cf. p. 34,—such a disposition of the material would have considerably increased the serviceability of the investigation and emphasized its actual significance.

So much for the field of inquiry and for the arrangement. The subject-matter itself is a promising piece of work and warrants closer analysis. The first division traces the development of the Proto-Germanic **andi* in a manner different from Kluge’s, *PBB*, x, 444, and manifests a skillful sifting of the data culled from etymological dictionaries. Among the latter, Falk and Torp, *Norwegisch - Dänisches Etymologisches Wörterbuch*, Heidelberg, 1910, might have been included, whilst the bibliography lists the second edition of Prellwitz, *Griechisches Wörterbuch*, altho the latter stands at variance with the first edition, cited on p. 2, in that it no longer features Old High German *unti* under *avri*.

From a negative statement in his third edition, "Vorgeschichte dunkel. Zusammenhang mit lat. *et* kaum möglich," Kluge, 8th ed., 1915, came to identify *und*, Anglo-Saxon *and*, with Sanskrit *átha* and *ádha*, 'farther, along,' < Indo-Germanic *enthá*, cf. Torp, in Fick, *Vgl. Wb*⁴. and Hirt, *Etymol. d. nhd. Sprache*, p. 78. Dr. Sehrt leans toward the explanation which seeks a relationship rather with Sk. *ánti*, Greek *ávri* and Latin *ante*, Idg. **antá*. We are told that Sanskrit *ath-* or *adh-* would correspond to a Germanic *und-*, i. e., *adhara: undar*, which would leave the Germanic forms with initial *a-* unaccounted for. Were it not for the fact that, in the face of the relatively latest appearance of German *und* (cf. Chapter III), an outcropping of this form subsequently to those of *anti* and *enti*, is out of the question, the Indogermanist would have at least two other explanations at his disposal. The one is the longer *nasalis sonans*, advanced but unillustrated by Kluge, who considers Ags. *and* and OHG. *anti* derived from *ande* or *ando*, where *an* represents the *sonans*. For the *nasalis*, the following putative examples will be of interest, Greek *κνήμη*, Ags. *hamm*, OHG. *hamma*, 'leg,' < **kñ-m*; Greek *ἄμαθος*, Old Norse *sandr*, OHG. *sant*, < **sñdh*. Opinions vary however with respect to the rôle played by the long *nasalis sonans* in Germanic phonology. Streitberg assigns to it no place at all, *Urgerm. Grammatik*, sec. 39, 4; on the other hand, Brugmann's application of it to Gothic *gaggan* and *blandan*, *Grundriss*², I, sec. 459, in the face of **bhlendh-* and **ghengh-*, surely represents the other extreme. But for the above-mentioned definitive obstacle, we would be inclined to propose rather a relation of *Vollstufe* to *Schwundstufe*, on the analogy of Idg. **dónt-* and **dñt*. Just as the former continues in Greek *δδόντα*, Ags. *tóð* < **tanþ*, Old Norse (*Hildi*)-*tannr* < **tanþr*, so pl. *teðr* (to *tōnn*) < **tanþiz*, Old Saxon *tand*, OHG. *zand*, whilst the silent form results in Sanskrit *dat-ás*, Latin *dentis* and Gothic *tunþus*,—in the same manner we might assume an Idg. **óndha* > Germanic *and-*, at the side of **ñthá* or **ñdhá* to account for German *und*. Doubtful tho such reconstructions must by their very nature be, the author might, it seems, have included mention of their possibility in his discussion.

However, we are given an ingenious sketch of the probable details of the other process. Accordingly, following a suggestion of Professor Collitz, the transition from the preposition **andi* to the

conjunction *and* may have taken place thru the substitution of the latter, after an analogical equation of the accusative with the nominative, (cf. Ags. *fæder and sunu*), for *jah*, in such a model as *fadar jah sunus*, whereby 'father upon son' became 'father and son.' The fact that Old Frisian still has a few examples of this original prepositional use of *and* in an adversative sense, e. g., *fara and tha saxinna merka*, seems to lend this theory a tangible support. For the semantic aspect of Gothic *and*, Delbrück, *Vgl. Syntax*, I, 740 ff., may be added to the above.

Chapter II, discussing the primitive function and meaning of the OHG. *joh*, a partial alternative of *endi*, *andi*, and arriving at the conclusion that *joh* is not a "derivative from" (p. 10) Gothic *jah*, but is a composition of *iâ auh*, a commendable work in itself, is in the nature of a long excursus, if the main theme of the dissertation is the conjunction *und*. It does attain considerable importance, if the delimitation of dialects be put in the foreground.

The next division contains the most interesting portion of the work, but receives a disproportionate share of attention. The explanation of the forms *anti*, *enti*, and *inti* is shown to be one independent of any ablaut relation. They appear rather to be the result of an *i*-umlaut which reached Old High German last of all the dialects and did not produce the form *enti* until the middle-of-eighth-century Bavarian. The force of the final vowel alters *enti* into *inti*, whereupon the sound weakens to a colorless *-e*. The next step seems not so imperative to us. Under the influence of a dark-vowelled word to which it stood in an enclitic relation, *inte* is supposed to have become *unte*. Early parallels like *untfahan*, *untfuor*, *untwîchan* would support this view. At the same time notice must be taken of such a direct transition from *e* to *u* as we have in Got. *þairh*, and even OGH. *derh* (*Voc. St. Gall.*), as against OHG. *durh*, *durah*, Ags. *þurh*, etc.

The available information concerning the gradual transformation of the conjunction is offered as a chronological and territorial criterion of the West Germanic linguistic documents. Delimitation in time, in that Bavarian and Alemannic show the form *anti* until 800, from 800 to 900 *enti* has been found to be the sole form, whilst *inti(e)* predominates in the following century. From 1000 on *unt(e)* and *und(e)* are the current forms. In space, in

that almost all the monuments which present the particle with a medial *t*, have been found to be Upper German, i. e. Bavarian and Alemannic, and East and South Rhenish Franconian; on the other hand, the dialects with a *d* were located in the Rhenish, Middle and Low Franconian region. A map, p. 52, visualizes the expansion of the conjunction on West Germanic soil.

A few actual examples of this control may be appended: The unique *anti* of the *Keronic Glossary* Kb has been found to have slipped in from the Bavarian prototype, since else the form occurs in the eighth century solely in the dialect of the Upper German territory, p. 26. In the instance of the *Second Merseburger Charm* the *ende* could hardly have originated, with the manuscript, from the tenth century, when elsewhere the form had given way to *indi*. Since, according to the other Rhenish Franconian documents, the *terminus ad quem* for *endi* was the beginning of the ninth century, the Charm must have been committed to writing before that time, p. 31. In a similar manner, the home of the Low Franconian translation of the *Psalms* is pretty conclusively fixed near the middle Franconian frontier, west of Aachen, p. 34.

With respect to the dialect of the *Hildebrandslied*, however, the author's application of the test cannot be said to have brought forth a conclusive result. In common with the Old Saxon *Heliand*, this fragment has thus far received an uncommon amount of critical attention. The former has been variously termed Old Saxon, Westphalian, Old Low Franconian; a translation from the Low Franconian; a confusion of Low German, Franconian and Anglo-Saxon. Professor Collitz (*PMLA*, xvi, 123) assumed, with respect not only to the *Heliand* but to the *Hildebrandslied* as well, an epic idiom, composed of Old Saxon, Low Franconian and Frisian elements, and altered in the course of scribal transmission. The latter itself contains ingredients from no less than four distinct sources, Low German, Frisian, Upper German-East Franconian and, if Kögel be right, (*Pauls Grundriss*,² II, 75) even Old Low Franconian. Besides the two explanations adduced by the author, p. 34, viz: a High German original copied by Low German scribes,—and this goes back beyond Braune and Holtzhausen to Holtzmann, *Germania*, ix, 289!—and, *vice versa*, a Low German original copied by a High German scribe, there are many other possibilities. Kauffmann proposes an Anglo-Saxon copyist of the High German text, Müllenhoff, Socin and Martin hold that

a Hessian or a Thuringian border dialect has been altered by a High German scribe. According to Trautmann, *Bonner Beitr. zur Angl.* VII, 68 the poem is an eighth century translation from the Anglo-Saxon into a Middle German dialect, and he perceives close resemblances, such as *her uuas hērōro man 7: hē wæs hārra man; westar ubar wentil-sēo 43: west ofer wendel-sā*, etc. Sievers, *Rhythm.-melod. Studien*, p. 129, calls the text, on phonetic grounds, originally a mixture of High German dialects.

These side-remarks are called forth by the author's assumption that the question can be reduced to one of two alternatives. He himself follows Kögel's view: the High German scribe consistently changes the Low German *d* to *t*, hence *anti*, *enti*, not *andi*, *endi*. And since *endi* appears only in Old Saxon, Middle and Rhenish Franconian, and the latter are excluded as the dialect of the poem, because of the loss of *n* before *þ*, Old Saxon territory remains the sole possible home. Dr. Sehart's admission, however, that the presence of *andi* points to a Bavarian influence, in that the first Abbot of Fulda and some of the monks were Bavarians,—and already K. Meyer, *Germania*, xv, 22, postulated a Bavarian source—bodes ill for his Low German standpoint, when correlated with the recent findings of Saran, in his *Hildebrandslied*, (Halle, a.S., 1915) which has only recently come to hand. For, after a research, which might be called the extreme degree of analytic refinement, Saran concludes (p. 86), on the basis of Rutz's doctrine of *Klangtypen*, of Sievers' verse-intonation and of his own rhythmic investigations, "Der Dichter des alten HL. war ein Bayer, der Beziehungen zu Fulda hatte und darum einige fuldisch-ostfr. Eigenheiten annahm. Dieser Mann, offenbar ein Dichter von Beruf, wie der des Heliand, dichtete für einen sächsischen Gönner und bemühte sich darum, soweit er konnte, seine Sprache nach der in der sächsischen Dichtung üblichen, an sich schon etwas gemischten zu formen."

The concluding chapter, giving the territorial expansion of the form *und(e)*, is a creditable investigation. In fact, while the dissertation cannot be said to have displayed its strong points to the best advantage, the impression it makes is that of a faithfully done contribution to the literature both of the conjunction of which it treats and of West Germanic dialect studies in particular.

ALEXANDER GREEN.

Johns Hopkins University.